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**Reciprocity or mutuality.** Within engagement literature, reciprocity and mutuality are highly conflated. Mutuality, the actions that yield mutual benefit, are often used as measures of success or benchmarks within engagement, collaboration, and partnerships ([D. E. Austin, 2004](#_ENREF_6); [Bringle et al., 2009](#_ENREF_16); [Community Campus Partnerships for Health, 2006](#_ENREF_27); [Hamel-Lambert, 2010](#_ENREF_58); [Holland, 2005](#_ENREF_63); [Jones, 2003](#_ENREF_69); [Miller & Hafner, 2008](#_ENREF_90); [Points of Light Foundation, 2001](#_ENREF_98); [Torres & Schaffer, 2000](#_ENREF_115); [Wiewel, Gaffikin, & Morrissey, 2000](#_ENREF_118)). Mutuality is also cited as the defining characteristic, or one of the few defining characteristics, of engagement activities and partnerships ([Bushouse, 2005](#_ENREF_20); [Farber & Armaline, 1998](#_ENREF_46); [MacKinnon-Lewis & Frabutt, 2001](#_ENREF_79); [Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001](#_ENREF_83)).

Engagement that employs mutuality can provide organizations and stakeholders the venue in which to work together, yet garner separate and autonomous benefits ([Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 1994](#_ENREF_93)). However, engagement that is framed in a democratic orientation leads to mutual transformation, not just mutual benefit ([Jameson et al., 2010](#_ENREF_68); [Saltmarsh et al., 2009](#_ENREF_106)).

In framing the concept of mutually transformative partnerships, Jameson and her colleagues ([2010](#_ENREF_68)) suggest that reciprocity extends beyond mutual benefit to encompass “mutual change and growth” ([p. 262](#_ENREF_68)). They believe the use of the term reciprocity to mean mutual benefit is but a thin definition. A thicker, more democratic interpretation of reciprocity acknowledges that it produces inherent challenges to the normative structures of engagement which necessitate institutional and community change ([MacKinnon-Lewis & Frabutt, 2001](#_ENREF_79)). Within the Community Outreach Partnership Center literature, Cox ([2000](#_ENREF_30)) delves further into this thick definition of reciprocity, noting that in addition to campuses assisting communities and communities assisting campuses, reciprocity denotes communities *informing* campuses and campuses *informing* communities. He later concludes that the practice of informing one another leads to the “fundamental reshape of institutions of higher education and the role they play in society” ([p. 17](#_ENREF_30)).

Jones ([2003](#_ENREF_69)) proposes that reciprocity dictates a desire and possibility for equality within the relationships between campus and community. This requires an equitable distribution of resources among the collaborators. Kari and Skelton ([in Barker & Brown, 2009](#_ENREF_8)) suggest that reciprocity enables trust within the stakeholders’ relationships. The elements of equality and trust insinuate the presence of respect.

The thick definition of reciprocity includes elements of equality and trust, both of which rest on the presence of respect, that result in community stakeholders and campus stakeholders informing the public work of the collaboration. A democratic orientation necessitates that we reshape our normative understanding of cooperation, which is based on mutuality, and embrace collaboration, which is based on reciprocity. Such democratic interpretation of reciprocity ([Saltmarsh et al., 2009](#_ENREF_106)) is present in both the work on mutually transformative partnerships ([Jameson et al., 2010](#_ENREF_68)) and the Kellogg Commission’s definition of partnerships ([Kellogg Commission, 1998](#_ENREF_71)).